

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON

MICHAEL BALDONI,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Case No. 03-1381-AS
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
UNUMPROVIDENT, ILLINOIS TOOL)	
WORKS, and GAYLORD INDUSTRIES,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Ralph E. Wiser
One Centerpointe Drive, Suite 570
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035

Attorney for Plaintiff

Katherine S. Somervell
Bullivant Houser Bailey PC
300 Pioneer Tower
888 S.W. Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204-2089

Attorney for Defendant

KING, Judge:

The Honorable Donald C. Ashmanskas, United States Magistrate Judge, filed Findings and Recommendation on December 13, 2007. The matter is before this court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Plaintiff has filed objections and defendant has filed a response.

When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate's Findings and Recommendation concerning a dispositive motion or prisoner petition, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the magistrate's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Having given a *de novo* review of the issues raised in the objections to the Findings and Recommendation, I find no error. I do note that the references to “Baldwin” in the Findings and Recommendation were in error and should be replaced by the name “Baldoni.”

Accordingly, I ADOPT Judge Ashmanskas’s Findings and Recommendation (#117) and DENY Baldoni’s Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (#92), GRANT UNUM’s Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (#100), and DISMISS Baldoni’s Amended Complaint with prejudice.

Dated this 9th day of January, 2008.

/s/ Garr M. King
Garr M. King
United States District Judge